

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY****PATENT****IBM Docket No. GB9-2000-0094 US1****Remarks**

The Office action rejected claims 1-5, 8 and 11 over cited prior art. These claims have been canceled.

The cancellation of claim 2 moots the objection to grammatical improprieties in the language of that claim.

The Office action objected to claims 6, 7, 9-10 on the grounds that these claims were dependent upon a rejected base claim. The action indicated the claims would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 6, originally a dependent claim depending directly from claim 1, has been rewritten in independent format by incorporating all of the limitations of claim 1 while retaining all limitations of original claim 6. This claim should be allowable as amended.

Claim 7, originally a dependent claim depending directly from claim 1, has also been rewritten in independent format by incorporating all of the limitations of claim 1 while retaining all limitations of original claim 7. This claim should be allowable as amended.

Claim 9, originally a dependent claim depending from claim 8, has been rewritten in independent format by incorporating all of the limitations of claim 8 while retaining all limitations of original claim 9. This claim should be allowable as amended.

Claim 10 depends from claim 9 and should be allowable for the same reasons as its parent claim. Claim 10 has been amended to substitute the American spelling of "synchronization" in place of the original British spelling. The claim has also been amended to eliminate a possible ambiguity as to which data repository was being referenced in the claim. None of the changes in claim 10 was made for purposes of overcoming prior art.

Claim 11 has been canceled.

Claims 12 has been amended to adopt the American spelling of "synchronization".

Claim 13 was not amended.

**BEST AVAILABLE COPY****PATENT****IBM Docket No. GB9-2000-0094 US1**

It is believed that all claims remaining in this application, as amended, distinguish over the cited prior art, comply with all other statutory requirements and should be allowed.

The Office action expressly indicates that the submitted drawings are acceptable and contains no objection to the specification. It is believed that this application is now in condition for allowance.

Respectfully Submitted,



Gerald R. Woods, Reg. No. 24,144  
Attorney of Record

IBM Corporation  
T81/503  
PO Box 12195  
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709  
919-543-7204  
FAX 919-254-4330